

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the telephone conference granted December 7, 2010. During that telephone interview, the newly cited Nagarajan reference was discussed as combined with previously cited Dexter. After hearing the arguments, the Examiner asked that these arguments be reduced to writing for consideration by the Supervisory Examiner prior to filing of an appeal.

Claims 71-88 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over AAPA in view of newly cited Nagarajan further in view of Dexter.

AAPA is the Dexter reference and Dexter is referenced as AAPA in Applicants' Specification. The relevant disclosure relied on by the Examiner in Dexter is Fig. 2 where scanner 102 scans an image to create a scanned image at 104. The Examiner analogizes this to the first rasterizing in claim 71. However this is not a first rasterizing of a print data stream. Rather it is only a scanning of an image. Thus the language of claim 71 readily distinguishes in this regard.

Secondly, claim 71 distinguishes by reciting that in the first rasterizing this rasterizing is done of the print data stream by use of a first object property. But merely scanning an image is not making use of a first object property and in fact there is no special first object property for the scanning at 104.

Thirdly, claim 71 distinguishes by reciting associating at least one second object property differing from the first object property with the selected at least one part of the at least one region of the print data stream. For this the Examiner uses digital image 110 and raster image processor 112 in Fig. 2. But when Dexter selects an object property for the rasterizing at 112, he is not using a second object property but is only using a first object property since there was never a first rasterizing of the

same print data stream using a first object property. Therefore it is not possible that Dexter could even remotely suggest a second rasterizing of the same print data stream using a selected at least one part of at least one region and associating a second object property differing from the first object property for that at least one region of that same print data stream.

Fourthly, claim 71 distinguishes by reciting that the second raster process is dependent on both of the first and the second object properties. But in Dexter, he is only rasterizing based on a single selected object property and not both first and second object properties.

The newly cited Nagarajan reference was cited by the Examiner at page three of the Office Action, third paragraph, for col. 3, line 62 to col. 4, line 6 of Nagarajan disclosing displaying print ready data on a display. However this has nothing to do with the above-noted four separate claim distinctions missing in Dexter. Therefore, Nagarajan does not satisfy the four missing features recited in claim 71 and not present in Dexter.

Dependent claims 72-79 distinguish at least for the reasons noted with respect to claim 71 and also by reciting additional features not suggested.

Method Claim 80 distinguishes for the reasons noted with respect to claim 71 but differs in one respect at the end of the claim by reciting the computer processing the print data of the selected part of the at least one region and rasterizing the print data of said selected part of the print data stream in a second raster process dependent on only the second object property. But of course in Dexter he only has a first object property and never a second object property and only has a single rasterizing of the print data stream and not two rasterizings of the same print data

stream where during the first rasterizing a first object property is selected. Thus claim 80 readily distinguishes.

Dependent claims 81-88 distinguish at least for the reasons noted with respect to claim 80 and also by reciting additional features not suggested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required, or to credit any overpayment to account No. 501519.

Respectfully submitted,

 (Reg. 27,841)

BRETT A. VALIQUET
SCHIFF HARDIN LLP
CUSTOMER NO. 26574
Patent Department
233 South Wacker Drive, SUITE 6600
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone: 312/258-5790
Attorneys for Applicant(s).

CH2\9404998.1